



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,477	03/05/2004	Roy A. Mangano	GEMS8081.202	2476

27061 7590 05/21/2007
ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS)
136 S WISCONSIN ST
PORT WASHINGTON, WI 53074

EXAMINER

NORMAN, MARC E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3744

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/708,477

Applicant(s)

MANGANO ET AL.

Examiner

Marc E. Norman

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-18, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8, 12-14, 19-25, 27, 29, 30, 33 and 34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-18, 26, 28, 31 and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9-11, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartlett et al.

As per claims 1, 7, 9-11, 15, and 17, Bartlett et al. disclose an MR recondensor de-icing system comprising superconducting magnet in a bath of liquid coolant 13 in a sealed vessel 11; a recondensing system 2 configured to cool the magnet; heating element 31 configured to melt iced particles from the recondensing system wherein power is delivered to the heating element in order to melt the iced particles from the recondensing system (see for example Abstract, lines 4-10; column 1, lines 45-48; column 4, lines 46-48; etc.); the sealed vessel being pressure sealed (pressure in vessel controlled by transducer 23); the vessel remaining sealed while the ice particles are melted; recondensor supply and delivery tubes (to and from compressors (Figure 2)); and plurality of heat exchangers/fins 18, 20, 22, 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-5, 16, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett et al. in view of Emeric et al.

As per claims 2, 3, 16, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35, and 36, Bartlett et al. do not teach a vacuum supply capable of removing particles from the condensing unit. Emeric et al. disclose vacuum pump 78. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the vacuum pump of Emeric et al. to the system of Bartlett et al. for the purpose controlling the overall pressure of the system, since this is a common feature of MRI cooling systems. It is further noted that the energizing of heating element 31 of Bartlett et al. is performed independent of braking a vacuum seal or of quenching the magnet.

Art Unit: 3744

As per claims 4 and 5, Emeric et al. further teach pressure sensor 104 connected to controller 80 which then controls vacuum pump 78 to maintain a desired pressure (Figure 2).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett et al. in view of Chen.

As per claim 18, Bartlett et al. do not teach an evacuation port. Chen teaches an MRI cooling system with evacuation port 29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the evacuation port of Chen to the system of Bartlett et al. for the general purpose of to ensure against excessive pressure buildup in the sealed chamber.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 8, 12-14, 19-25, 27, 29, 30, 33, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on 571-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Norman', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

**MARC NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**